

The  
State Department  
Speaks



FONDREN LIBRARY  
Southern Methodist University  
DALLAS, TEXAS

*A series of four broadcasts, presented over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Company on January 8, 12, 22 and 28, 1944 to acquaint the American people with what the Department of State is doing to meet international problems*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
PUBLICATION 254

---

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
Washington 20540

# The State Department Speaks

\*\*\* January 8, 1944 \*\*\*

## PARTICIPANTS

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| EDWARD R. MORTON, Jr.    | Under Secretary of State   |
| ELSON CLARK, Jr., D. Sc. | Advisor to the Secretary of State on Internal Security<br>Issues for the European Area |
| LEO PATRICK              | Special Assistant to the Secretary, in charge of post war planning                     |
| Mrs. GEORGE J. McDERMOTT | Chief of the Division of Current Information   |
| HENRY HARRISON           | Representing the public  |

**WASHINGTON ANNOUNCES** For the American people, the National Broadcasting Company launches tonight a limited series of programs called "The State Department Speaks." To introduce the series—to tell you the ideas behind it—we present the Honorable Edward R. Morton, Jr., Under Secretary of State. Mr. Mortonton:

**STATEMENT.** A few weeks ago the National Broadcasting Company invited the Department of State to participate in four broadcasts to tell the American people more about our work in the Government, and wrestling about the problems involved in carrying out an American foreign policy. We in the Department of State were very glad to accept this proposal because we want to use every opportunity to keep the public informed about what the Government of the United States is doing to meet our inter-

national problem. It is your Government and it is you who in the long run determine what our foreign policy shall be. As most of you know, the Department of State is the only department of your Government which deals directly with governments of foreign countries. At its head is the President's senior Cabinet officer, Secretary of State Cordell Hull.

During this evening's program and the other programs in this series, Mr. Richard Harkness, MPC commentator, will undertake to represent you, the public, in posing questions to the State Department officials who appear on the program. Mr. Harkness has warned us that he is not going to be worried with any "handouts." He says he is going to ask questions which he thinks you people would ask, if you had the chance. We have told Mr. Harkness that we would try to answer them as fully as we can.

We shall make available to him as many of the responsible officials of the Department as he wants to talk to, and his list for the four programs already includes Secretary Hull, all the Assistant Secretaries of State, several division chiefs, special advisors, at least one Ambassador, and myself as Under Secretary. Because the Department of State works closely with the Congress in the formulation of foreign policy, you will also hear from some of our congressional leaders during the course of these broadcasts. The National Broadcasting Company is to be congratulated for this effort to bring closer together the State Department as a whole and the millions of people it represents in their dealings with foreign nations. Now Richard Harkness will carry on with the first program of "The State Department Speaks."

HARKNESS: Thank you Mr. Stettinius, and good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is Richard Harkness. I'm speaking to you from a large four-story building on Pennsylvania Avenue, in Washington, next door to the White House. If you're ever looking out of a window

in this building, and you see a man on the street shudder when he looks toward it, you can bet your life that man is an architect. For this building—the Old Lady of Pennsylvania Avenue they call it—is no architect's work. Its pillars and columns and capitals, its whole ginger-bread granite construction, goes back to a time that is devil and gone. Amen. But don't get me wrong! The Old Lady of Pennsylvania Avenue has no hang-dog appearance! For this grand old building is the home of our Department of State—the official address of the man who would succeed to the Presidency in case of the death or disability of the President and Vice President. Its rooms are thrones to many stirring events that dot the pages of our national history—drugs, scandals and others.

I'm sitting here in the office of the Secretary of State. Across the way is the sitting room where Woodrow Wilson and Herbert Hoover that fateful Sunday in 1918. Up on the walls of this room are the portraits of some of our most distinguished Secretaries of State—men who have handled and guided our foreign policy down through the years. There's William Brewster of State when the Japanese first started their conquest in Manchuria in 1931—now our Secretary of War.

There's Kellogg, the author of the Kellogg pact, who tried so hard to outlaw war forever. There's Theodore Roosevelt's Secretary of State Lansing, and the remarkable, bearded Charles Evans Hughes, who served under Harding and Coolidge. Yes, there are memories in this room, many of them, and a spirit of dignity and nobility must be part of it—a spirit that is the proud heritage of our Department of State. Yes, this is the room where Secretary Hall meets the press every day, but I'm the only newspaperman he's brought. I'm here as your representative. I'm here to find out what goes on within these walls—to try to peek behind the veil of mystery and secrecy which popular tradition says can

rounds the activities of the State Department. But I can be successful as your representative only if you help me. Write me the questions you want answered about our State Department and I can't promise to use them all, nor to acknowledge them, but I'll use some of them, and, in any case, your questions will help guide me in laying out my interviews with the individuals Mr. Nicholson mentioned a few moments ago.

And now let's get on with the first set of them. I listed through tape records that one of the best men to go to for information down here is Michael J. McDermott, known affectionately throughout the State Department and to many newspapermen in Washington as "Mac". He is the Chief of the Division of Current Information. He's the guy who keeps us members posted on what's going on in foreign affairs and he's always ready for us, day and night. Mac is right here with us now, and two other gentlemen you will be glad to meet. But before I talk to them, Mac, tell me: does your division have any share in formulating the foreign policy of the United States?

McDERMOTT. Let me answer you that way, Dick. Every man and woman in the United States who is so inclined can have a share in formulating our foreign policy, but in order to do this, they need accurate information to guide them in forming their opinions. We help to make information on foreign affairs available to them through press and radio fellows like yourself and we help them judge and analyze for themselves what is going on in the world. And, as I said before, they in turn—I am talking now about the man in the street—decide in the last analysis what our national foreign policy shall be.

Thank you, I see. In other words, you're saying that the work of our press and radio has a lot to do with the actual formulation of our foreign policy by giving the people the facts on which they form their opinions.

McDERMOTT: Right, but I know what's on your mind primarily tonight, Don. You're interested in getting some straight dope on the Moscow Conference and what goes on in our post war planning work.

HARRISON: You bet I am.

McDERMOTT: Well, here are two gentlemen, two experts who will be able to help you out. Each of them has made a life study of international affairs. Mr. James C. Dore has specialized particularly in international political relations, and Mr. Leo Pasovolsky is known as an outstanding expert on international economic affairs. And so all I can say to you, Don, is go ahead and ask them anything you want. I am sure they'll do their best to answer you.

HARRISON: O. K. Now, I think I'll start with Mr. Pasovolsky, who, I understand, is a Special Assistant to the Secretary of State in charge of post-war planning. Is that right, Sir?

PASOVOLSKY: Yes, that's right.

HARRISON: Well, do you mind telling me something about what you post war planners do, and how you got started and what not?

PASOVOLSKY: Certainly, Mr. Harrison. When war came in Europe we had one of the most difficult jobs of international relations in our history. It entailed not only the conduct of foreign affairs in a world at war, but also preparation for meeting the problems which this country was bound to face after the fighting was over.

HARRISON: Are you saying, Mr. Pasovolsky, that our State Department's preparations for meeting post war problems began upon the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939?

PASOVOLSKY: That's right. And, we were actually at work early in 1940.

HARRISON: How did you begin?

PASOVOLSKY: We started off with a group of consultants to study the future implications for this country of what was happening elsewhere.

in the world. In February 1941, the Department created a special research unit for this purpose. Of course, both the committee and research work became real post war planning after December 7, 1941.

HARRISON: Well, that's getting an early start, tell me—what are the main subjects your planning unit is working on today?

PARVULAK: First of all, there is a group of subjects relating to arrangements necessary for the conclusion of the war. These comprise the terms to be imposed on the enemy nations after their surrender, including control of the enemy countries after they have been occupied by the United Nations forces, and the strategic demilitarization of the world.

HARRISON: I see.

PARVULAK: Another group of subjects relates to liberated areas. Briefly, these include exploring the problems of reestablishment of independence in those countries which have been deprived of their freedom by the Axis invaders. Many of these countries don't forget, will be starving and disorganized. They will need relief and other help in reestablishing their economic life.

HARRISON: Of course. Go on Mr. Parvulak.

PARVULAK: A third group of subjects is related to the all important problems of providing for the future maintenance of peace and security.

HARRISON: Now you are reaching right into the hearts of almost two billion people—two billion people who have learned now what total war is and who never want to see another one. What are our State Department's plans on how to preserve the peace, Mr. Parvulak?

PARVULAK: Well, we start with the basic assumption that the elimination of war and the establishment of security for all nations requires co-ordinated effort on the part of the peace-loving nations, based on order under law.

HARRISON: Yes, but how are you going to go to



national cooperation? No one has ever yet succeeded in doing that for long.

PAULSKY. We know that, Mr. Harkness, only too well. But we are not and we must not be discouraged. We believe that cooperation between peace and freedom-loving nations can be achieved in times of peace as it has been achieved in times of war. To do this these nations must create certain facilities and institutionalize for international action.

HARKNESS. Such as——?

PAULSKY. Well, there must obviously be arrangements for settling international disputes by peaceful means rather than by recourse to war. But above all, there must be arrangements for suppressing aggression.

HARKNESS. Now what a beautiful, Mr. Paulsky. Seems to me that was tried even before, with the League of Nations.

PAULSKY. Yes, it was—up to a point. But this time, as Secretary Hull has long maintained, there must be the clear certainty for all concerned that breaches of the peace will not be tolerated, that they will be suppressed—by force, if necessary.

HARKNESS. Good! You suggested a question some which I will ask you later, Mr. Paulsky, but please continue. Seems to interrupt.

PAULSKY. I think nothing of it, Mr. Harkness, we are used to interruptions. The fourth group of subjects in our post war work covers the problem of developing relations among nations which will help improve their economic and social conditions. These fields include so many ramifications dealing with trade barriers, tariffs, customs, aviation, shipping, labor standards, migration, education and so forth, that I could keep you here for hours talking about them. We are trying hard not to miss any practical idea or plan through which international cooperation can help make for a better world to live in. I might add, Mr. Harkness, that we

are not in foolish haste to think me in order these problems to the State Department alone or even to the Government as a whole. It's a tough job which will take the best thought and effort of all of us.

HARRISON: I sure agree with you on that. But tell me, what happens to all these plans of your group? As soon as they're formulated they immediately become part of our foreign policy—is that it?

PARSONS: Oh, indeed no! Not that way! It's more like the camel going through the eye of the needle. Here's what happens, Mr. Harrison. Each question is thoroughly explored by the Department's expert staff, in cooperation with experts of other departments and agencies. All available information is analyzed and worked into memoranda which set forth the pertinent facts about the particular problem and the diagnostic methods open to us for solving the problem. The memoranda are examined and discussed by committees or line functional groups, and the resulting proposals are embodied in recommendations as to the most desirable of the alternative solutions. These recommendations go to the Secretary of State and through him, to the President. But even then, before taking final decisions, the Secretary and the President discuss the matter with high officials of the Government and also with members of Congress and with competent persons outside the Government. These decisions become our basic line of policy to be pursued in negotiations with other governments.

HARRISON: Safe and sane is the word for it, Mr. Parsons. Seriously though, it's good to know, as just an ordinary everyday American, that so much careful thought and consideration are being given to the planning of our foreign policy.

PARSONS: Of course, you mustn't forget one important thing, Mr. Harrison. All the careful plans in the world are of no use until they are

agreed to by the other nations involved, and such agreements can come only after discussion and negotiations with those nations.

HARRISON I can see that. Wouldn't you say that much of the real example of translating peacetime planning into action was the famous Moscow Conference?

PANOLBY Without a doubt, Mr. Harrison.

HARRISON Fine! Let's see then what happened to those plans of yours at Moscow. Mr. McDermott, you went to Moscow, didn't you?

McDERMOTT Yes, I did, but here's the man who really can tell you what happened there. Mr. James C. Dunn, Advisor to the Secretary of State on Political Relations for the European Area.

HARRISON O K, Mr. Dunn. Let's get right down in business. You went to Moscow yourself, and I suppose you were in on all the arrangements that had to be made before the Conference could be held.

DUNN Yes, I was.

HARRISON I imagine making the preparations for such a momentous meeting as the Moscow Conference is not exactly child's play, Mr. Dunn.

DUNN You're certainly right about that, Mr. Harrison. The Moscow Conference didn't just up and happen over night. A lot of mighty hard work went into the preparations for that meeting of Mr. Hull, Mr. Molotov, and Mr. Stalin. As Mr. Panolby just explained, we had behind us almost three years of general preparations on post-war problems. That was the bedrock on the basis of which we were able to compress our final preparations into four or five weeks.

HARRISON That's very interesting and significant—you had four or five weeks' final preparations for the Conference. Let's see now your meeting in Moscow began on October 19—that means the actual decision to hold the Conference must have been made sometime in early

September 1943. Am I about right, Mr. Dunn?

Dunn: Yes—you're 100 percent correct in that case Mr. Harbison. The decision to hold the Moscow meeting was made by President Roosevelt, Marshal Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill very shortly after the Quebec Conference.

Harbison: That's an interesting piece of news. What were the reasons for the Moscow Conference? What did you expect to accomplish? What did Russia want—and what did we want?

Dunn: Well, bringing it down to almost real-time questions, the Russians were primarily interested in matters of military aid and cooperation to crush Nazi Germany as quickly as possible. We, of course, were equally concerned with this question. But, in addition to that, we were vitally interested in finding out Russia's attitude on cooperation in building a durable peace after the victory had been won. Secretary Hull knew that that question had to be faced and that the answer it was faced the better for all of us—Russia, Britain, China, and the United States. And that's why there was a Moscow Conference and why the Secretary traveled 25 thousand miles by air and sea to make our contribution to it as we can.

Harbison: Well, what happened at the Conference Mr. Dunn?

Dunn: As Secretary Hull as soon as he arrived, pointed out to Marshal Stalin and Foreign Minister Molotov that the nations represented at the Conference and their leaders bore a greater responsibility for the future life, liberty and happiness for their own and all other peoples than any nations or individuals had ever lived before.

Harbison: That's no kidding?

Dunn: He made it quite clear that he would speak frankly in the national interests of the United States, but he also said that he was convinced that there was sufficient common ground

between the national interests of the three nations  
 trying to lay the basis for a better world.

HARKNESS: How did the Russians take that?  
 DEWEY: I think they liked it.

HARKNESS: What would you say was the  
 greatest achievement of the Moscow Confer-  
 ence?

DEWEY: I think it was the Four-Nations Dec-  
 laration, including as the President and Secre-  
 tary Hull so strongly desired, the great Repub-  
 lic of China.

HARKNESS: What are some of the big points  
 in the Four Nations Declaration?

DEWEY: Well, here are several of the main  
 points. In the first place, the four nations re-  
 affirm their determination to continue the fight  
 until their respective enemies have laid down  
 their arms as unconditional surrenderers; sec-  
 ondly, the four nations will continue their pre-  
 sent united cooperation into the future to or-  
 ganize and maintain peace; and finally, a  
 general international organization should be  
 established as soon as possible, based on the  
 principle of the sovereign equality of all part-  
 taking states, and open to membership of all  
 such states, large and small, for the main-  
 tenance of international peace and security.

HARKNESS: Then, as I understood that im-  
 portant last point, this does not mean that the  
 "Big Four" nations expect to run the world  
 alone, according to their own desires.

DEWEY: Absolutely not Mr. Harkness. And  
 that's a very important point. The President  
 and Secretary Hull had long held the con-  
 viction that the only sure method of maintaining  
 the security of the United States in the future  
 and avoiding other terrible wars was the estab-  
 lishment of a general system of international co-  
 operation in which all nations, large and small,  
 would play their part. This basic principle be-  
 came the core of the preliminary draft of the  
 Four Nations Declaration which the Secretary  
 of State took with him to the Moscow Confer-  
 ence.

HARRISON: What was that you said, Mr. Dunn? Did I understand you to say that Secretary Hull took the draft of the Four Nations Declaration with him to Moscow?

DUNN: Yes, that's correct—he did.

HARRISON: Hmm! Mac, that's something you didn't tell us. Well, anyway, Mr. Dunn, you really mean without any reservations that the Moscow Conference was a success?

DUNN: Yes, Mr. Harrison. The Moscow Conference marked a dramatic and monumental milestone in the development of our foreign policy, not because it settled all the difficult issues but, rather, because it settled the most important single question, which up to that time no man could answer with certainty.

HARRISON: What was that?

DUNN: That question was whether the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, China, and ourselves were determined to seek peace, and the world's salvation through international cooperation, or whether they had other plans and designs for the future.

HARRISON: And the answer to that question was, what we wanted?

DUNN: Yes, it was, I am happy to say. Those four nations committed themselves to a policy of restoring cooperation. If they hadn't done so, the international future would indeed be a hopeless one. The dread certainty of a third world war would have settled on us even before World War II is finished. I believe that this is the true meaning of Moscow—by their pledge of a continued cooperation both among themselves and with the other peace-loving nations of the world, these nations have given mankind a shot the world has at least the possibility of a peaceful future.

HARRISON: Thanks a lot for those interesting insights on the Moscow Conference, Mr. Dunn.

I've got several other questions I want to ask you, but right now I'd like to put out to Mr. Parovskiy before it slips my mind or he gets away from me. Mr. Parovskiy a little

think again, and I think that the State Department believes that in the future, breaches of the peace must be suppressed by force, if necessary. Now does that mean an international police force?

PARSONS: You know a lot of people are talking about an international police force, but nobody has as yet figured out just what it means. So I can't give you a yes or no answer. But I would like to say this. There are many ways in which police power can be exercised to suppress aggression. We are considering several possibilities, but we cannot tell at this stage what precise arrangements the nations will be able to agree on. That will depend on a lot of things here and abroad. But one thing is certain: there will be no commitment involving this country without the clear approval of the American people.

HARRISON: In other words, that is one of the answers which is yet to be worked out and agreed upon, is that right?

PARSONS: It certainly is.

MCDERMOTT: Dirk, might I add a word there?

HARRISON: Sure, Mr. Parsons.

MCDERMOTT: That discussion between you and Mr. Parsons illustrates pretty well one of the toughest problems we have in the State Department. In a sense you didn't get an answer to your last question, and yet Mr. Parsons did explain why he couldn't answer more fully.

HARRISON: Yes, and quite satisfactorily for me.

MCDERMOTT: The point is that we're up against that sort of thing day and night in the State Department, and quite often there are equally good reasons why a particular question cannot be answered.

HARRISON: Well, what, for instance?

MCDERMOTT: Well, it might be for reasons of military security, or possible war and destruction by enemy propaganda, or possible subversion.

ment in one of our Allies or a country, or friendship, or at least neutrality in support of us. Whatever the reason, Dale, you can be sure that we don't hold back simply for the sake of being impartial.

HICKMAN: I know that, Mac, and I think most of us would feel the same way you do about those "no comment" cases of the Cold War, which and we were in the Department's place.

Mr. DUM, let me ask you this: Some people have been saying that we are inefficient as to whether Fascism stays in Italy as long as Mussolini is out. Is there anything to that?

DUM: There most certainly is not. We intend to see that Fascism in Italy is pulled up by the roots. This point was covered definitely by one of the important declarations issued at the Moscow Conference.

HICKMAN: That's right, it was. And I'm glad you mentioned it, because I happen to think that declaration on Italy is in a mighty important and solid place in our foreign policy.

Mac, getting back to something we said earlier and which a lot of people are always saying around the State Department. You say it's the 130 million American citizens who in the final analysis decide our foreign policy. Now that sounds well, Mac, and makes us all seem very important, but what is the average citizen supposed to do—pick up the phone and call Secretary Hall in Washington and tell him what he wants? How about it Mac? How can the average person help guide American foreign policy?

McDermott: Very simply, Dale. We have a free press and a free radio in this country, and we have representative government and a voting system that is very, very inexpensive. Any body who wants to play a part in forming our foreign policy has merely to sit down and write a letter to his favorite editor, or write to his Congressman, or his Senator, or to the President, or to the State Department and say what he thinks. Also, don't forget, that's easy to



doesn't belong to some group, whether it's a labor, business, agricultural, church, or educational group, and through these or similar groups, he can make himself heard in an effective way.

HARRISON: In other words, it's democracy at work again. Right, Mr.?

WEDDERBURN: Right.

HARRISON: Well, this fire, gentlemen, even in Washington. The fire half hour here at the State Department is almost up.

I think it's been profitable and I want to thank all of you, Messrs. Sullivan, Down, Partridge and McDermott, for making it so. We've learned a lot from all of you this evening, we've been taken behind the scenes at the State Department's post war planning, we've seen how that planning became foreign policy in action at the famous Moscow Conference and we've had a chance to get your important questions answered.

Next week ladies and gentlemen, I have another fine group of interviewers lined up, with Under Secretary Sullivan, Assistant Secretary Ryan, Ambassador Winant, who will talk to us from London, and Ambassador Robert D. Murphy. Our general topic will be "The Organization of the State Department and the Foreign Service." Some questions I intend getting the answers to are: It is much work must a young man possess before he can hope to get a position in our Foreign Service? Is it true that the graduates of our or two public law universities are favored or considered over others? What kind of work is done by the men and women in our foreign service? What salaries do we pay them? And so forth, and so forth. If there are any questions that occur to you, won't you send them to me immediately? That'll help me to plan my interview. And now—till next Saturday evening at the same time—this is Richard Harkness saying "Good night" from Washington.

January 15, 1944

PART FIRST

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| LEONARD L. MORTIMER, JR. | Under Secretary of State  |
| in the room next         | Executive Secretary of State  |
| JOHN J. BROWN            | United States Ambassador to London (speaking from London)                             |
| ROBERT D. MURPHY         | United States Ambassador at Large (American member of the Advisory Council on Policy) |
| HAROLD H. HARKNESS       | Representing the public   |

WASHINGTON, ADVOCATES For the American people, the National Broadcasting Company presents the second of a limited series of programs called "The State Department Speaks." We go now to the State Department Building on Pennsylvania Avenue here in Washington, D.C.

HARKNESS Good morning ladies and gentlemen. This is Richard Harkness—past representative in this timely series of programs designed to tell you something about your State Department—how it works, the work it does, and the people who run it. Here in the Secretary of State's office on the second floor of the old State Department Building, I am ready to interview for you such well known people as Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Under Secretary of State, of Donald Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, John G. Winant, American Ambassador to Great Britain, who will speak to us from London, and Ambassador Robert D. Murphy, who has just returned to this country from some very interesting experiences abroad.

To begin with, thanks to you listeners for your cards and letters suggesting questions I

should act on those rogues. They've been most helpful. Keep them coming!

Now let's try getting some of your questions answered. First, these questions having to do with the set up of the State Department and its work. And here are two men who can speak with authority—Under Secretary Stettinius and Assistant Secretary Shaw.

Mr. Stettinius, I understand you have something interesting to tell us tonight concerning the important announcements which Secretary Hull made today.

Stettinius: Yes, Mr. Hackman, I do.

Hackman: Good! But before we go into that, I'd like to get a brief picture of the State Department's work. Mr. Shaw, you're the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the administration of the Department and of our Foreign Service. Suppose you give us that picture, Sir.

Shaw: In brief, Mr. Hackman, the business of the State Department is to represent this country in our dealings with foreign governments in matters covering many of the most important problems of the day.

Hackman: Like the Munich Conference, for instance?

Shaw: Yes—and such things as the negotiation of loans for our armed forces, the conclusion of many treaties and commercial agreements. But in addition the State Department does a great deal of work having little or nothing to do with foreign governments. Actually, most of our daily business is with Americans. I put ourselves in to ask us to do all sorts of things for them. We maintain daily contacts with Congress and keep in touch with American public opinion as a whole. Furthermore, normally a large part of our work is with other departments of our Government. For instance, getting information on foreign markets which the Department of Commerce distributes to American businessmen, getting data on foreign labor con-

ditions for the use of our Labor Department, getting information abroad for the use of our Agriculture Department to be used in world crop forecasting. Today in war we work especially closely with these departments and other agencies of the Government in economic warfare work, the acquisition of needed materials for us at sea, and a multiplicity of other warlike activities.

HACKMAN. Well I suppose it is the State Department Foreign Service that actually carries out many of these jobs in foreign countries.

SEAW. That's right. But it's called the Foreign Service of the United States and not the Foreign Service of the Department of State. Our Foreign Service officers receive their commissions, not from the Secretary of State, but from the President of the United States. They serve the Government of the United States as a whole. There are in the eyes and ears of our Government in foreign lands, the advisers of our ministers and the interpreters of its needs.

HACKMAN. Every one of our country abroad would seem to me to require a pretty able American.

SEAW. It certainly does. Our work today demands able men with many different skills—men with many kinds of experiences. There are some duties here, but particularly exciting as I can say Ambassador Wadsworth and Ambassador Murphy will tell you later.

HACKMAN. All right. Now, Mr. Seaw, many of our listeners have sent questions asking whether to get a job in our Foreign Service you have to come from the so-called "right" social background, have the right connections, have gone to the right schools, and be a native of the eastern section of the United States. Is there any truth in that, Sir?

SEAW. No, there is not. Let me answer you point by point, Mr. Hackman, and with concrete facts. Let's start with that eastern section and work off the last three groups of 117 persons to enter the Foreign Service. 19 came from the

far West, 75 from the Middle West, 19 from New England, 25 from the Middle Atlantic States, and 16 from the South. So you see they were pretty well scattered geographically throughout the country. And that's true not only of the last three groups to enter the Service but of the men who came in during the past 10 years. Moreover, these men came from all parts of the United States, but from over 50 different universities and colleges. And—so far as earlier schooling was concerned—at least half of them received their education in our public high schools. Many of our men have worked their way through school. One young man who entered the Foreign Service recently, prepared for his examinations by studying nights in the Detroit Public Library. To support himself he worked during the day on the assembly line of an automobile plant.

HARRISON: That's interesting and good to hear. But Mr. Shaw, how about the general opinion that a man needs a certain kind—well—the so-called "right" kind of social background to enter the Foreign Service?

SHAW: Neither one of those statements is true, Mr. Harrison. The vast majority of men in the Foreign Service today have no independent income whatever and must rely entirely on their government pay. Now about this "social background" business. The truth is that we want the Service to be broadly representative of American life. I can answer that question again in terms of the last groups of new men to join our Foreign Service. The fathers of these young men followed in a varied occupations as railroad conductors, carpenters, ministers of religion, schoolmasters, bankers, grocers, laborers, lawyers, radio manager-clerk and physician.

HARRISON: Well, that list seems to spike on other rumors, Mr. Shaw. But how did you go about selecting foreign Service men?

SHAW: Through a good staff examination.

HARRISON: Just how tough is it?

SEWER: Well, take about one out of seventeen passes the test. If they've got the stuff, we want them in the Foreign Service. If they haven't got the stuff, we don't want them, no matter what else they have—money, degrees, or name.

HARKNESS: That's good American doctrine.

SEWER: Yes, and it results in giving us men who are a cross section of all America—and that's just what we're after.

HARKNESS: Before we went on the air, Mr. Sewer, you said something about not doing any recruiting for the Foreign Service just now because the men you would want are going into the armed services. What are your plans for the future on that?

SEWER: I am glad you brought that up, Mr. Harkness, because just as soon as the war is over we will be needing new men in the Service and we will look first to the returning soldiers to fill our ranks.

HARKNESS: Thank you, Mr. Sewer. Right now I want to call in London to ask one of our most distinguished ambassadors abroad to tell us something about his job of representing 180 million people. Can you hear me, Ambassador Wootton in London?

WOOTTON: Thank you, I can, Mr. Harkness.

HARKNESS: Well, to begin with would you tell us something about your work and the people you have to work with as American Ambassador in London?

WOOTTON: It has been customary over long periods of time for governments to communicate with one another through embassies. I have charge of the United States Embassy in London. The two men I work most closely with are the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, and the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Eden. We work together as freely and as frankly as any three people can work together. There is no unnecessary formality, but always an honest effort to get the job done, whatever the job may be.

HOMERUS I have a hunch that yours is a mighty tough and complex job, and I wish you could tell us briefly something about it.

WISLART. In wartime, with Great Britain and the United States coordinating production and supply and fighting under a common command, the area of coverage and the volume of business have been enormously expanded. Modern warfare, which involves entire populations of countries, has forced the establishment of civilian war agencies which are represented and coordinated within the London Embassy organization for the European theater of operations.

The backbone of the Embassy organization are the former Foreign Service officers. They are address, efficient, and hardworking. Aside from handling relations-Japs between government, our assignments include obtaining bases and other facilities for our Army and Navy, dealing with supplies through Lend Lease and so on. Lend Lease so that the right food and the right weapons are in the right place at the right time, so that they are to be used by our Allied forces or our own. They include production problems and civil use problems, economic warfare, which means finding ways and means of depriving the enemy of supplies he really needs, and psychological warfare, which includes laying down by leaflet and radio a barrage of truth against enemy propaganda, information services, and other necessary activities to meet war needs.

There are no immunities and some hardships, especially for those men in the Foreign Service who have been for years away from home, but there is not a man here who does not see that life has back of the work he is doing and is not grateful for the chance to serve the fighting man.

We have tried hard to be useful to the soldiers, the sailors, and the women who today are your true substitutes in England, just as the true substitutes are the brave homes they come from.

It is on the relationship that they are building that the future of the world must largely rest.

A tribute in the *London Daily Express* to the American women who died on a recent raid over Germany will give you some understanding of the respect and friendship of the British people for our fighting men. The newspaper said:

"It was, alas, easy to tell yesterday where the hearts of the British people turned in regard to America—to the homes of the lost women from Maine to California, to the forests and the pastures, the city apartments and the home-lands to the churches. The loss of sixty flying fur-trimmed coats or bedroom-furniture is as if it were our own. Whence came these gallant crews among us? Why did they wage their way to our aid? These age-old young Americans flew in aid of the common cause of true decency as the world put its brave soldiers stand alongside ours in Italy or in the trenches for no other purpose. They came on a rendezvous with us to rid the earth of Nazi terror as we shall be found shoulder to shoulder with them cleansing it of the Jap horror. That is what puts."

HAYKNE: Thank you, Ambassador Winant. Good night.

WAXMAN: Good night to you all.

HICKMAN: And in a back to the second ranking officer of the Department of State. Mr. Rothman, you became Under Secretary of State early last fall, did you not?

SPERRYMAN: Yes, Mr. Haykne, in October.

HICKMAN: And how long did it take you, Sir, to find your way around in this new position? I know that, right after you took office, Secretary Thill left for the Moscow Conference, which meant that you became Acting Secretary of State right away.

SPERRYMAN: Yes, that's right. And under very unusual circumstances, which, I can assure you, gave me an excellent opportunity to become quickly acquainted with the work of the Department and its people.



**HARRISON** What were your recollections? You came into the Department as an experienced businessman and Government official, and I assume you brought a fresh viewpoint with you.

**SULLIVAN** I came here as Under Secretary, first with a profound admiration for Secretary Hull and, secondly, with an open mind about the task ahead. It was then my judgment—and it was not my definite knowledge—that the State Department as a basically sound institution. It has as its leader one of the great Americans of our time, Cordell Hull; it has an experienced and loyal staff, and it represents a country whose purposes are reasonable and aboveboard. In my opinion not foreign affairs which present the worst problems are basically sound.

**HARRISON** Am I to understand then, Mr. Sullivan, that you are completely satisfied with everything about the present State Department set-up?

**SULLIVAN** No I am not. And I might add that is true of Secretary Hull and our mission. For many businesses, the State Department has had to conduct its normal operations in war conditions. That always means making rapid administrative changes and the result is there are bound to be rough spots. And, to complete the circle of change, the Department must prepare itself to turn its full facilities again to the problems of the peace.

**HARRISON** Well—Are you getting ready for that time?

**SULLIVAN** Yes, we are. One of the first things I undertook for the Secretary was to study with Assistant Secretary Shaw and other officers how affairs within the Department should best be organized to carry the terrific load of foreign-policy work which faces us in the months and years ahead. I am very happy to say that Secretary Hull today announced a reorganization plan of the Department.

**HARRISON** That's just what I've been wait-

ing to, Mr. Stettin, when Secretary Hull stated that he had asked you to discuss some of the highlights of the plan tonight. Won't you, please, tell us a little about it?

HARRISON. Well, of course, everyone will realize that we need an efficient and smoothly running State Department as possible for the great tasks before us.

HARRISON. Of course. What does the reorganization accomplish?

HARRISON. The new organization connects with current difficulties, but its chief purpose is to prepare us to meet most effectively the heavy responsibilities which are ahead both for winning the war and making a secure peace.

The new organization accomplishes several objectives. First, it readjusts the responsibilities of the top officers of the Department so that they may devote the biggest part of their energies to vital world affairs.

HARRISON. Well, you mean then they are being relieved of some of the administrative details which have tied them down up to now?

HARRISON. That's right, and, secondly, the new organization establishes clearer lines of responsibility and authority within the Department. To do this we have reorganized and regrouped many of the activities.

In the third place, the work of the higher officials of the Department will be more closely coordinated.

HARRISON. Well, now, Sir, is there anything you can say concretely about this?

HARRISON. Yes, one of the most important steps being taken is the establishment of two principal committees composed of high officers of the Department. Secretary Hull will be Chairman and I, Vice Chairman of these committees. One will be a Policy Committee which will be concerned with the full scope of our international affairs.

HARRISON. And what is the second of these principal committees, Sir?

Secretary: That is to be called the Council on Post War Foreign Policy. It will formulate and submit to the President recommendations and advice on post-war foreign policy.

HARRISON: That means, I take it, that all foreign policy matters, both current and future plans, will now be cleared and coordinated through these two committees.

Secretary: That is correct, but I wish to emphasize that the final important purpose of the organization is to establish a mechanism to deal with new problems of an international nature.

HARRISON: I notice that on the chart you have shown before you, Mr. Secretary, one of the new divisions is that of Labor Relations—would that be a more apt illustration of that last point you made?

Secretary: Precisely—but with our limited time, we'd better not get bogged down these details here tonight, Mr. Harrison.

HARRISON: Well, I wish we could, but I certainly want to thank you, Mr. Secretary, for that important piece of news and your comments on its significant balance. But we almost forgot to touch on that other important announcement which will be of interest to our audience.

Secretary: Today Secretary Hall created an Advisory Council on Post War Foreign Policy to be composed of outstanding and representative national leaders. This Council will advise the Secretary of State on post-war foreign policy matters of major importance.

HARRISON: Secretary Hall has already named several outstanding citizens to serve on that Council, hasn't he?

Secretary: Yes. He has appointed Mr. Norman H. Davis, Chairman of the American Red Cross; Ambassador Myron C. Taylor, and Dr. Louis Bowman, President of Johns Hopkins University, as Vice-Chairmen of the Council.

HARRISON: Before we tackle Ambassador

Robert D. Murphy, may I ask a final question, Sir, on the reorganization. Will it work?

HARRISON: It must work, Mr. Harkness, and I can assure you that it is Secretary Hall's firm intention and mine to leave no stone unturned, as time goes on, to see that our State Department is fully equipped to discharge its responsibilities to the American people in the days ahead.

HARRISON: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Now ladies and gentlemen, here's Ambassador Sir Robert D. Murphy—the man you'll remember reading about or having arranged for General Clark's secret visit to North Africa before the landing of Eisenhower's armies. Mr. Murphy, can you tell us something about that visit—the time the General had the bad luck to lose those new famous pants of his?

MURPHY: Well, a couple of weeks before our troops landed, it was decided that General Clark and several other officers would make a secret visit to North Africa to get some first-hand ideas of what reception our forces would get from the French when they landed. We made very careful preparations with certain patriotic Frenchmen for that visit. As you all know, General Clark and his staff came ashore in the dead of night at an isolated spot and successfully completed their mission in spite of a threat of discovery by local police officials.

HARRISON: Well, how about those pants?

MURPHY: Ah, about the pants. It was in making his get away to the submarine that the General had to leave his pants on the beach. When we went down to remove all evidence of the visit after the General had put us away, I found among other things, his pants.

HARRISON: What do you do with a pair of general's pants?

MURPHY: Just what I would have done with the pants of any other friend under similar circumstances—I had them cleaned and pressed, and advised the General that they'd be there for him when he came back.

**HARRISON** And as we all know, the General did come back. But that time he had plenty of company with him—Eisenhower and his gallant staff. I would like to get from you, Mr. Murphy, some of the background of that landing. In our pre-broadcast chat, you said that during 1940, 1941, and 1942, when our military preparations needed time and our prestige was weak, you worked to regain French faith in us. Why the lack of French faith in us then?

**MURPHY** Because, in 1941, many Frenchmen in North Africa honestly believed that the United States would never succeed in preparing for war in time to stop Germany. We eventually got that idea out of their heads, but winning popularization takes a long time and those anxious months seemed endless to us.

**HARRISON** The proof that you laid a firm foundation came with the successful landing of our troops in November 1942. But I recall that you were severely criticized for dealing with so-called "Vichyites" in North Africa before the invasion. Now, you know on this program there is no hidden hand. I want to ask you: How can deal with such people?

**MURPHY** You bet we did, Mr. Harrison! When you're working under a egg with a tiger, your technique has to be quite different from that of the independent and ruthless radio-stationing safely outside. Remember always that we were operating in a zone of strong enemy influence. It was inevitable at times that we were obliged to cultivate and associate with people for whose politics we had no sympathy. That association did not mean that we approved the point of view of certain French circumstances or suggested to even our authority at the time—but these Frenchmen were indispensable in preparing for the landing of our forces in Africa, and so we dealt with them. I would like to point out, however, something that has not always been clearly understood up to now and that is that certain so-called "Vichy

men summoned in all to Váby on the railway only so they could help us in preparing the way for the arrival of our troops and the material liberation of France.

HARRISON: That's an important point.

MURPHY: But in any case I will cheerfully admit that for the purpose of saving the lives of the American boys whom I saw come over the beaches of North Africa I would deal with any person terrible or unbearable. I knew that once our power was established, my Government would cooperate with the French in the removal of dangerous installations. But first things come first. I know I could not save the men there and some of our soldiers who might be killed by reason of any reluctance on our part which would have prevented the practical arrangements under which our soldiers were protected.

HARRISON: Well, I think our historians who have sons and brothers and husbands in the front line tonight will understand that point. What was your work after the invasion took place, Mr. Murphy?

MURPHY: I was then assigned to the Allied Commander in Chief, General Eisenhower, as a member of his staff.

HARRISON: That was the first time that a Foreign Secretary's office ever became a member of a military staff, wasn't it?

MURPHY: I believe it was.

HARRISON: Eisenhower must be a great fellow to work with.

MURPHY: Indeed he is. I can't praise him too highly. His cool and sound judgment, his great personality, were the dominating factors behind the extraordinary cooperation between the Allies in North Africa during the most critical moments of the war.

HARRISON: Mr. Murphy, I want to ask you about the Dardanelles affair. You remember there were a lot of people over here saying that we were backing the wrong horse after our troops

had pitched in dealing with Vichy. I'm an advocate of Free French de Gaulle. The fact that General de Gaulle was being decorated adds to justifiability.

MURPHY: Yes, I know about that reaction and I don't mind telling you that I was nobler guided by it.

HARRISON: You were? Why?

MURPHY: You must remember that the whole aim of our foreign policy in North Africa at that time was to save as many Americans lives as possible, and to do everything in our power to give a quick and inexpensive victory. True, General de Gaulle was utterly on the war, and he and his men deserve every credit for having maintained French honor and for carrying on the fight during those bitter months. But don't forget this—at the time of the American landing, Admiral Darlan had at his command 200,000 soldiers and sailors in Africa while General de Gaulle then had only a handful by comparison. That's why we worked with Admiral Darlan. And I can tell you that he is valued very justly and mentioned by the Allied cause. Perhaps the best proof of this is found in the fact that, whereas our Army leaders expected the usual loss of the North African landing to run to 15,000, it actually was well under 2,000, including Army and Navy.

HARRISON: Well, that answers quite a few questions straight from the shoulder, Mr. Murphy. Thanks. I might point out to our listeners that Ambassador Robert D. Murphy is one of the few civilians ever to be awarded the Distinguished Service Medal. General Eisenhower pinned it on him for the excellent military job he did as head of our Foreign Forces in North Africa.

HARRISON: Let's see how our time is. I think we have time left for just one more question for you, Mr. Harrison. Last week on this program we discussed the Moscow Conference, and that broadcast stirred up a large number of

questions from our listeners concerning post-war cooperation with Soviet Russia. You have been a long-standing friend of Soviet Russia, Mr. Stettinson, and you as Lord-Lewis Ashmun-Under helped to get our ship up to Russia. What do you think about cooperation with Soviet Russia after the war?

STETTINSON: I have worked closely with the Soviet officials here for over three years and I have nothing but admiration for the energy, resources, and determination of the people of the Soviet Union. I feel we have everything to gain and nothing to lose from a continuing and close cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States both now and after the war. Anything else would be nothing less than tragic wandering for both of us.

HASKINS: Well, time's almost up, so thanks to all of you gentlemen—Mr. Stettinson, Mr. Shaw, Ambassador Murphy, and Ambassador Wynant, who hurried the midnight train to London to be with us this evening. Next week the State Department stands in the main hall will include Mr. Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Mr. Dean Acheson—both of whom are Assistant Secretaries of State, and Mr. Harry C. Harkins, Director of the new Office of European Affairs.

I hope all of you ladies and gentlemen listening in will be with us then. Meanwhile, send me your questions. And now—this is Richard Harkins saying "Good night" from Washington.



553 January 22, 1944 666

### PARTICIPANTS

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| WALTER A. BROWN, JR. | Vice-Chief, Secretariat of State               |
| WILLIAM A. STANTON   | Assistant Secretary of State                   |
| CHARLES E. HANFORD   | Director, Office of Economic Affairs           |
| CHARLES P. TAYLOR    | Director, Office of Western Hemisphere Affairs |
| EDWARD HANFORD       | Representing the public                        |

WASHINGTON ANNOUNCES For the American people, the National Broadcasting Company presents the third of a series of four programs called "The State Department Speaks." We take you now to the State Department Building on Pennsylvania Avenue here in Washington, D.C.

HANFORD Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is Edward Hanford, your representative on this series of programs arranged by the National Broadcasting Company with the cooperation of the State Department and designed to reveal in simple terms the work of our Department of State. On the first program of this series we heard about the Moscow Conference and the post war planning work of the State Department. We were told that in the final analysis the foreign policies of this country are determined by you and me and our neighbors next door. Last Saturday the national program brought us word of a reorganization of the State Department and gave us a close up of the work of the Department and the United States Foreign Service in protecting and promoting American interests abroad—in war and in peace. Tonight we are going to try to find out about a few of the things which some people may know more—*in other words*, we are going to ask some interesting questions about economic relations between nations. We are



going to find out what relation, if any, there is between bread and butter and peace and war, and we have with us four gentlemen who are outstanding experts on the subject. First, there's Mr. Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State. How do you do, Mr. Berle?

BERLE: Good evening, Mr. Harkness.

HARKNESS: And Mr. Dean Acheson, also an Assistant Secretary. Welcome to our program, Mr. Acheson.

ACHESON: Thank you, Mr. Harkness. I'm glad to be here.

HARKNESS: Then welcome Mr. Harry C. Hopkins, Director of the State Department's Office of Economic Affairs, and Mr. Charles P. Laff, who is the Director of the Department's Office of Wartime Economic Affairs. Good evening, gentlemen.

HOPKINS and LAFF: Good evening, Mr. Harkness.

HARKNESS: All right—let's get on.

Mr. Acheson, you are the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of economic affairs.

ACHESON: That's right, Mr. Harkness.

HARKNESS: Well, suppose we start off by asking you a question that must be in the minds of many of our listeners, and that is, Why is the Department of State interested in such a dry, unlikable sounding subject as economics?

ACHESON: I think we can convince you that it's not a dry, unlikable subject, Mr. Harkness. And I'm sure we can demonstrate how important international economics are to all Americans—the farmer in Iowa, the banker in San Francisco, the miner in Pennsylvania—on war and in peace.

HARKNESS: Good! But first tell me your definition of "economics." I don't want any dictionary definition as you can well understand.

ACHESON: Surely, Mr. Harkness. I use the word "economics" as an over-all term for producing things, moving them, and using them.

The international wartime economic position of the United Nations is to bring these things to bear against the Axis with maximum efficiency. Our own and our Allies' arms and peoples have to be fed, clothed, and furnished with thousands of articles—"things", I called them a moment ago—all the equipment of a soldier, all the equipment of a ship, and all the equipment and food and clothing that people require in their ordinary daily lives.

To produce all these things and to move them to the right places, in the right amounts, at the right times—all under stress of a gigantic war effort—to do all this we need the help of other governments and peoples. It's the purpose of our foreign-economic policy to work these out with other countries in such a way that we and our Allies get the help we need and that our enemies don't get it. I'd like to make this point clear. In all these problems, the State Department works closely with the Foreign Economic Administration. Between them they carry out almost all of the foreign economic operations of the United States Government.

HARRISON: How do you go about doing that?

ACQUARO: Well, you've two different areas to keep in mind. Mr. Harrison, first, you've the countries which are allied or associated with us in this war. Secondly, there are the neutral countries. With the first or allied group, we have arranged for a mutual stepping up of all essential production, decreasing down—so far as possible—all non-essential production, and finally, by refusing to send anything to places where it might reach the enemy.

HARRISON: That's in the case of allied nations, Mr. Acquaro. Now—how about the neutrals?

ACQUARO: Here our task is much more difficult. These countries, unlike our Allies and associated nations, are not joined with us in the fight against the Axis. But we have things

work they want badly, and the other things which we want badly—we thus gain at the same time the chance to start a bargain.

HARRISON: Yes, but what do we do about keeping these neutral countries from supplying the enemy with materials he needs?

ANSWER: Well, that's what we have to do some mighty hard bargaining, and such hard bargaining is a part of our campaign of economic warfare.

HARRISON: Mr. Acheson, please? Before we go any further, suppose you explain that word used often "economic warfare." What does it mean?

ANSWER: It means simply beating the enemy by preventing him from getting the things he needs. Economic warfare is carried on in many ways. By the Navy which prevents ships from taking things to the enemy; by the air forces, which destroy enemy factories, and by the military agencies, which interfere with the enemy's getting supplies from neutral countries. One method by which the military work is done is through trade bargains—this hard bargaining with the neutrals which I mentioned a moment ago.

HARRISON: What is the general nature of these bargains? I realize you can't go into the particulars because of possible aid to the enemy, but maybe—

ANSWER: Well, take a material which is essential to the German arms industry and which it gets from a nearby neutral country. Our air forces and the R. A. F. bomb the German arms factories. This interferes with home production. But that isn't enough. We must see to it that the lost production of those bomb-blasted factories is not replaced from neutral countries, and, too, we must also see to it that materials on which German factories depend don't get to Germany from other countries.

HARRISON: Well, that's understandable. Mr.

Secretary, but you still haven't told us what you do in that case. How do you stop the material getting from a neutral country to Germany?

ANSWER. Well, let's take a concrete example. If a neutral country which supplies material to Germany is asked to sell us anything else from us we say to them, "You can have the things you get from us only if you stop trading with such a war material to Germany."

HYMAN. Well, suppose they tell you that they have to sell the war material to Germany in order to live?

ANSWER. In that case, we are willing to buy it from them. Sometimes we really want the material, and sometimes we don't, but we don't care about that—the big point is to keep the valuable war material away from the enemy whether we need it or not.

HYMAN. I see. Well, Mr. Anderson, let's leave the economic warfare measures for a little bit and consider what our State Department is doing in the economic field for the period after the war. Isn't it true that we have begun while the war is still on to deal with post-war problems?

ANDERSON. Yes, you just don't wait until the last gun is fired to begin preparing for the economic conditions which you know will be present when the war ends. When that day comes, the populations of countries which have been occupied by the enemy will once more be free, but they will be free in a pitiable condition. The enemy is now using their work, their railroads and factories and farms and their products for his own benefit. It's the selfish system that is in operation there. You can see then that on the day the enemy is driven out, the whole system will fall to pieces, and it will take some time to put it together again so that it will operate for the benefit of the liberated peoples. If a load of things moved into your house and wrecked it, you wouldn't expect to find

...agreements regarding food and medicine.

HARKNESS: That's true.

AMMAN: So inevitably some time must have to be lost providing them with required materials. You get going again. This will be an extremely critical time. During this period the people of these countries must have the things which are necessary to keep them alive and to hold them together. If they don't get these materials, the result will be widespread starvation and disease, starvation and disease will produce rioting and disorder, and you can't build a peace in the midst of chaos. To prevent this, the United Nations must agree now upon ways and means to help these countries get on their feet again.

HARKNESS: Well, Mr. Secretary, there has been quite a bit of agreement on these ways as I understand already. Isn't there?

AMMAN: Yes, indeed, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is one of the best examples. That organization—called UNRRA for short—was created last November after negotiations carried on by the State Department. Forty-four United and Associated Nations signed the agreement which set it up. The Council of the organization had its first meeting at Atlantic City a couple of months ago.

HARKNESS: Yes, I know. I covered that conference for APB, and, as I recall, you were elected Chairman of the First Session of the Council of the UNRRA organization.

AMMAN: That's correct. You'll recall, also, Mr. Harkness, that we adopted a resolution program for bringing relief and rehabilitation to the areas which are being liberated from the Axis.

HARKNESS: Yes, I know you did, and that brings some thing to mind, Mr. Amman. Some people are referring to this program as a case of the United Nations playing Santa Claus again. Is there any truth in that, Sir?

ARMSTRONG: In my opinion, there is not! There is always a strong temptation to place blame upon a party, understand that, and to say we ought to do this from a hard-headed point of view and that it will pay good dividends. That is true, but it always seems to me that that is not the way in which we Americans approach a question of the war in which a question is really illuminated. Unless people begin to understand other people of the world we are going to have disaster. In order to feel sympathy with another people must take notice of their side, and it is only when they are willing to do so that a people have a right to leadership on the world. And finally we are not doing more than our part when all the United Nations are contributing to this work in an equalable way.

HUGHES: Thank you Mr. Armstrong—we'll get back to you in a few moments. Now a question or two for Mr. Taft. Mr. Taft, you are the new Director of Wartime Economic Affairs. I take it that means you handle the State Department's end of the economic warfare work which Mr. Acheson handles rather?

TAFT: Right.

HUGHES: I imagine you have a lot of headaches in that job?

TAFT: Right again, and they are more than you can possibly imagine.

HUGHES: Give me a few examples, Mr. Taft, would you?

TAFT: Well to pick one at random, there is the so-called "black list" work. The black list is another weapon of economic warfare. It is an especially important weapon in these days of total war. Long before they began their military aggression, the Nazis had organized a network of Nazi sympathizers in other countries to keep them awake. They were very active in the countries of this hemisphere, and, what is worse, many of them were making their living off of American trade.



HICKMAN: Just what do you mean by that, Mr. Taft?

TAFT: Just that. A large number of foreign Van Lines in South America were living off of the business which they had with the United States. At the same time these firms were contributing a large share of their profits for propaganda and other subversive activities against the United States and hemisphere unity.

HICKMAN: Well, how could these pro-Van Lines men go about their subversive activities?

TAFT: Let me give you just one actual case. There is a very big company in one of the border Argentine countries. This company was the agent for a large United States concern and received from the United States firm a considerable advertising appropriation.

HICKMAN: And what did they do with it?

TAFT: They used this money to advertise the United States company's products. But they would not serve to place this advertising money with any papers except those which were Nazi newspapers.

HICKMAN: You know, Mr. Taft, that sounds almost like divine retribution, doesn't it?

TAFT: It may sound that way, Mr. Hickman, but our files are filled with thousands of cases of similar Nazi practices.

HICKMAN: Well, how does the black list deal with such people?

TAFT: When we learned about that firm I just mentioned, we put them on our published black list—which is usually known as the Proclaimed List. By this action the firm lost its agency and all its United States business accounts. It couldn't buy from us or sell to us, nor could it use our banks or our mails. And while that firm trembles on our black list any one who deals with it runs the risk of being put on the list himself.

HICKMAN: Well Mr. Taft, that's one kind

"I want to share with all of us an understanding—perhaps the Nazis and their Fifth Columnists. Oh, by the way—how many ignore me as that black hat today?"

YAFF: Over fifteen thousand!

HAWKINS: Good enough. Thank you, Sir. And now, here's something I want to say:

Ladies and gentlemen, before we come on the air tonight a man said to me that, in his opinion, there might have been no World War II if the statesmen who read and carried out the peace terms after World War I had paid as much attention to economic matters as they did to such things as political boundaries.

That man was Harry C. Hawkins, Director of the Office of Economic Affairs of the Department of State.

All right, Mr. Hawkins—explain, please!

HAWKINS: Gladly, Mr. Harrison. Let me start by saying that I think it is critically important that we Americans never lose sight of some of the lessons the past 25 years have taught us. The most important of these lessons is that no political and military situation for maintaining peace can stand for long if the nations of the world are engaged in trade warfare.

HARRISON: What do you mean by "trade warfare" between nations, Mr. Hawkins? You're speaking of actual trade now and not of economic warfare such as Mr. Arthur just described, are you not?

HAWKINS: Yes, Mr. Harrison, I am speaking of the so-called "normal times", but I really meant what I said when I used the term "trade warfare". Many of the trade warfare methods used by the nations against each other in the twenties and early thirties were only slightly less harmful in effect than many of the economic warfare measures which were being against our enemies today!

HARRISON: Well, that's calling a spade a spade. But what were some of these peacetime trade warfare measures?

HAWKINS. Well, you know, from a number, more were trade barriers against goods coming from another country. High tariffs and quotas are common forms of trade barriers. And there are also discriminations of various kinds. I mean by that the deals made between some countries to the detriment of others. And these other countries often retaliated, of course.

HAWKINS. What countries were in blame for all this?

HAWKINS. Well, it's impossible to assess degrees of blame but, as you say, no better than the rest. We carried our full share of the trouble.

HAWKINS. Well, just how do these trade barriers hamper work against international peace?

HAWKINS. They cause serious economic headaches in other countries by depriving the producers in those countries of an outlet for their products. When countries can't sell their products abroad they have to stop buying from abroad, and so it goes until every country is refusing to buy every other country's goods. International bitterness and even enmities are the result.

HAWKINS. Well, wait a minute, Mr. Hawkins—this international bitterness, you speak of—it doesn't necessarily mean war, does it?

HAWKINS. No—not of itself. But, when nations are trading products whose sale means unemployment and breadlines and are continually hitting each other's vital interests, they are not likely to cooperate to keep the peace.

HAWKINS. I suppose not—but—let's get down to cases, Mr. Hawkins. Do you believe that in order to have peace, we must do away with all trade barriers? That we've got to have a world-wide free trade?

HAWKINS. No, I do not. Trade cooperation does not mean free trade. It does mean that nations must get together and work out their international economic policies in a spirit of mutual understanding. It does mean the re-

duction of excessive trade barriers and doing away with trade discriminations between nations.

HAWKINS: Well, so far we've been speaking of the relationship between sound trade policies and peace, Mr. Hawkins. But there's another point that a great many of our listeners want discussed. That is, how much, if any, national sacrifice to these policies might be required in other words, how much is post war trade cooperation going to cost and

HAWKINS: I don't think it'll cost us anything. On the contrary, I think we'll benefit by it. In the first place we'd like to know exactly in dollars and cents if these policies turned out to be insurance against another war. It's well to ask ourselves the sobering question whether this nation could afford another war within the next 25 years.

HAWKINS: What do you think about that?

HAWKINS: Well, personally, I don't think it could and still remain anything like the nation it is now. But let's look at the costs in national dollars and cents aspects. Let's look at it from the viewpoints of the farmer, the businessman, and the worker.

Take the needs of our agriculture as a whole. Our home market alone cannot provide an adequate standard of living for our farmers—they must be able to share in the world market.

Next—take our manufacturing industries. They are going to need protective markets as wide as we have never had before. Our industrial leaders know that only the great world market has potentialities corresponding to our need.

And finally, what is labor's stake in our international trade policies? Many of our labor leaders have made it clear that they are looking ahead and that they see security and opportunity for labor in terms of expanding security of industry based upon reciprocity in international trade.

HARRISON: Let me ask a question there, Mr. Hawkins. What's so terrific about this world market that seems to mean so much to our agricultural, business, and labor leaders? What possibilities does it have?

HAWKINS: Well, Mr. Harrison, the world outside the United States has a population of more than two billion people—that's 15 times the population of this country! Many millions of these people are virtuous whose income standards and purchasing-power are very similar to our own.

HARRISON: Yes, but the vast majority are poor as far as income—aren't they?

HAWKINS: True, the great majority are extremely poor—by our standards—but, though their individual ability to buy our products is limited, in the aggregate their purchases are very large.

HARRISON: In other words—farmers, industry, and labor—that is all interested in a world market. All right—what's necessary in order to develop this world market?

HAWKINS: Willingness to be paid.

HARRISON: Willingness to be paid? What do you mean? Why would we refuse to be paid for what we sell?

HAWKINS: Well, we do just that when we shut out goods from other countries. The only way in which people in other nations can get the dollars to buy our goods is by selling us their goods. If we refuse to buy their goods they won't have our dollars with which to buy the things we want to sell them.

HARRISON: Well, that's certainly as clear as anyone could state it. But on the other hand, won't these imports put our own producers out of business? What about the low wages and low living standards abroad? How can our producers stand up against that kind of competition?

HAWKINS: The way you put that does need consideration—but it needs thoughtful considera-

then, not snap judgments based on the easy acquisition of such data.

Competitive ability depends mainly on efficiency of production. Low living standards and low wages do not necessarily mean efficiency in production. In fact, misery and efficiency do not usually go together.

The fact is that although many of our industries pay the highest wages in the world, the unit cost of their product is so low that they can compete successfully in foreign markets where wages are far lower. Low wages are, in fact as well as in logic, usually accompanied by low efficiency. What counts in the competitive world market is total cost per unit of product, not simply labor cost per hour.

HARRISON: Then to sum up what you have said—

HAWKINS: All that I have said comes to about this. From whatever angle we view the post-war situation, trade policies of nations—particularly the larger ones, and I say important—our interests, our businessmen, our workers, all of us as taxpayers and consumers, have a big stake in an expanding world market. And so, I've said, trade policies will be an important factor in determining whether we will this time win and retain the post-war banner heading into another bitter, costly world war.

HARRISON: Thank you, Mr. Hawkins.

And now we turn to Mr. Adolf Berle, who is an Assistant Secretary of State. Mr. Berle I'd like to get your views on the relationship of peace and sound international economic policies. Won't you run up the situation as you see it?

BERLE: Well, we've got to remember that it's the everyday activities of men and women who is not the big patterns of human behavior. The phrase "foreign relations" describes the end result of a great mass of underlying factors. You are friends with, and work with other countries because you trade with them as a naturally

satisfactory home; because your people travel freely and happily there, and their people come freely and happily here, because your ships, your airplanes, your telegraph, your radio, and your postoffice can render a real service both abroad and at home.

There are not merely the private advantages of private traders. There will also add up to the result of friendship in business; or, in extreme cases, of peace or war.

And so it is the business of the State Department to try to see that these various privileges are so handled that the best interests of the United States are protected and promoted and that, in so doing, we do not threaten or injure the safety and prosperity of other friendly countries.

How now. That's an interesting situation up of the situation Mr. Boyle. I'd like to ask if you can mention some of the specific problems which are ahead and are in a very serious situation.

Boyle. Well, for example, there are labor problems of an international nature. The Department's new Division of Labor Relations has been working with the Department of Labor and other interested groups on these matters. Of interest in this connection is the meeting of the International Labor Organization which is to be held on April 20th or 21st at Philadelphia.

Then—the volume—of internationalization, in instance, there aren't any boundaries because the rules in wage wouldn't know a boundary, if it was open. Traffic through the air is no longer a novelty—and every country in the world has its interest in air-transport problems. Some of these questions are wholly new in the world's history because they arise out of new discoveries. Their solutions ultimately have to be fitted into the pattern of world organization as it finally emerges. Is the idea of sea power, which stabilized the world for some time, still valid in terms of modern sea power? Will international relations be the same when anyone

as any country, can talk to anyone in any other country as freely as it used to talk together on the same level.

No country—except in rare circumstances—can afford to be either on the giving or the receiving end of a headline—permanently. So the principle has to be to find the ways by which the interests of our country can be protected and at the same time give increased opportunities to other countries to improve their as a international life.

There are all parts of the same problem. They come from the fact that economic life throughout the world is pretty closely connected. If the elements work together for general well-being, we have peace. If they struggle against each other, no peace is likely to be having.

HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Boardman. Now let's get on to some other questions and to the big business.

HANCOCK: Mr. Harkness, earlier you spoke about the material we had in enlarging our markets abroad for American exports. Don't we also have to make sure that we can get adequate essential commodities from abroad? To League office, I mean oil. You hear a lot of talk these days about dwindling American oil reserves.

HANCOCK: That's right, Mr. Harkness. We cannot continue to use our American oil even at the rate we have used it in the past without exhausting our supplies. We know that we'll have to look abroad for oil. Of course, the primary immediate use for oil is in running war. But in the years to follow, we will need oil for expanded commercial aviation, greater industrial output, more automobiles, more fuel for homes, more oil burning ships and so on.

HANCOCK: Well, what are we going to do about it?

HANCOCK: The Atlantic Charter provides that all countries shall have access on equal terms to the world's raw materials. That



doesn't apply just to foreign countries. It applies to us as well. Americans are already developing great oil fields abroad. The State Department welcomes and wants to encourage this development. The Department will certainly see to it that the interests of American nationals in foreign oil resources will get an even break.

HARRISON: Thank you, Mr. Hawkins.

MR. ALEXANDER: Do you agree with Mr. Hawkins that our oil supply is so precious that we need to economize it as much as possible with foreign oil to conserve what we have over here?

ALEXANDER: Yes, I mean certainly do.

HARRISON: All right, Sir—then answer this question. A great many of our listeners ask why if our oil supplies are so scanty, do we send this precious fuel to Spain?

ALEXANDER: Well, Mr. Harrison, this is one of the cases in which we are discussing a few minutes ago—where we bargain with neutral countries for products which both we and our enemies want. Do you recall that?

HARRISON: Yes.

ALEXANDER: Well, that's the reason for our sending oil to Spain.

HARRISON: Oh, I get it! But there's another matter I want—to satisfy many more of our listeners. These people are fearful that the oil we are sending to Spain is getting into the hands of Germany. What have you to say about that, Mr. Tamm?

TAMM: I will be glad to answer that, Mr. Harrison. By way of background I should say that the oil which is going from this hemisphere to Spain does not come from continental United States but from the Caribbean area and is carried out in our ships but on Spanish ships. So far as its getting into the hands of the enemy—we have taken full precautions to see that this does not occur. The tankers are checked at the port of loading and again at the port of discharge by our own crewmen. In addition to most formal assurances from the Spanish Gov-

crimined, that the oil so furnished will not be re-exported from Spain, we maintain in Spain a staff of observers whose sole duty it is to check the distribution and use of this oil. These contracts have been in effect since 1935, and we have secured no evidence indicating diversion to enemy destinations or arms uses. Of course, you understand that quantities of oil which go to Spain in this manner fall far short of that country's normal supply.

HACKMAN: All right, Doc. Well, I guess we've now got to answer quite a number of the questions that you've got up here, and I want to thank you gentlemen for appearing here to participate in this show. Mr. Ashton, Mr. Berle, Mr. Hawkins, and Mr. Ladd. Next week my line-up of outstanding personalities will include Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Speaker Rayburn of the House of Representatives, Senators Connally and Vandenberg, and Assistant Secretary of State Breckinridge Long. I hope all of you people listening in will be with us then. And now—this is Richard Hackman saying "Good night" from Washington.

\*\*\* January 29, 1944 \*\*\*

PARTICIPANTS

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| MODERATOR             | Senator Joseph  |
| SEMINAR LEADER        | Speaker of the House of Representatives   |
| UNITED STATES         | United States Senator<br>Chairman of Committee on Foreign Relations of United States Senate |
| UNITED STATES SENATOR | United States Senator<br>Member of Committee on Foreign Relations of United States Senate   |
| UNITED STATES SENATOR | United States Senator<br>Member of Committee on Foreign Relations of United States Senate   |
| UNITED STATES SENATOR | United States Senator<br>Member of Committee on Foreign Relations of United States Senate   |

WASHINGTON ANNOUNCEMENT: The American people, the National Broadcasting Company presents, the fourth and last of a special series of programs called "The State Department Speaks." We take you now to the State Department Building on Pennsylvania Avenue here in Washington D. C.

HARKNESS: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is Richard Harkness. Tonight as your representative, I find myself in distinguished company indeed. Seated around this table in the Secretary of State's office are Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Speaker Sam Rayburn, Senators Tom Connally and Arthur H. Vandenberg and Assistant Secretary of State Brockunier Long. As you can judge from that list, our subject this evening is the important one of the relationship of Congress and the State Department in the formulation and execution of our foreign policy—the role played in these processes by the elected representatives of the people in the Senate and the House of Representatives. Mr. Secretary, would you say something on that subject?

I cannot imagine a more open-minded or both more honest and more intelligent man. I know he is right; I have never argued with him. He is not a doctrinaire person. He gets a new perspective on a question, full-blown, in the middle of a foreign policy. I need not tell my three old friends and former colleagues who are here with me tonight, not the rest of the members of the House and the Senate here, concerning I am at all times of what I felt when I was brought in the other end of Independence Avenue. For the past 11 years it has been my pleasure to work with them off in, including in my garage, but in the Department, as at the Capitol, to connect together frankly and fully on questions involving the well-being of our country.

Under our system of government the safeguarding and promotion of the nation's interests is a joint responsibility of the Executive and the Legislature. No shot can be effective without the other, and the two together can be effective only when there exists between them mutual trust and confidence. In peace and in war, the two branches of the Government are joint trustees for the country's destiny.

And all of us are being asked to do truly unprecedented war tasks.

In this struggle, the Executive and the Congress have one thought, and one aim—to do everything that may be needed to bring the war to a victorious and as rapidly as possible American standstill, in the name of every patriot dedicated with mind and whole heartedly to the great ideal of our nation. Dark days are well ahead, but there is in our hearts complete confidence that the unswerving efforts and heroic sacrifices of our heroic armed forces and of a nation united at home will bring us through to victory in this war for self preservation from the forces of evil.

Equally important, the tasks will need to be organized so that the Government at the different levels

FONDREN L 9

Seetharam, Methodol. Appl. Stat. 2019, 12, 121

— D. A. Elms

that a 1941-1942 season of hostilities. I am sure the post-war tasks will be a great deal easier than those which face us now.

Our supreme task in the future, will be to make sure that all this does not happen again.

I deeply believe that this great goal is possible of attainment. To attain it our nation and the other peace-loving nations must be firmly resolved never to permit differences between them to reach the point of armed conflict; but rather to adjust them by peaceful means. We and the other peace-loving nations must be equally resolved and prepared to use force if necessary—promptly, in adequate measure and with certainty—to prevent or repress acts of aggression by nations which may refuse to be peace-loving members of the family of nations. Finally, we and the other peace-loving nations must be resolved to cooperate cordially and effectively in order that there may be created for all nations and all peoples greater opportunities and better facilities for political, economic, social and educational development. Such cooperation is essential if there is to be any hope of eliminating the causes of inter-national conflicts.

The Congress, by non-partisan action, and the Executive, through wise and judicious leadership have placed on record the country's determination that the supreme task of the future shall be successfully accomplished. All of us are acutely aware of the fact that behind this determination is the united will of our people. All of us know that we can be true to the trust reposed in us only if we find effective means of making sure that what is happening today does not happen again.

It is not enough for our nation alone to stand firmly behind the kind of program for peace-keeping that I have briefly described. The achievement of such a program requires united action by many nations. It must be our task to exert to that end every power of our influence.

the—It requires patience and tolerance, and good will, and resolution to play our full part, and every other attribute of enlightened leadership. There will be many difficulties to overcome. They can be overcome if our people continue to see clearly that the price of failure is national disaster and if the Congress and the Executive continue to work together.

HARRISON. Thank you, Secretary Hall. Now, I know that all of us, including yourself, will listen with great interest to what your distinguished friends have to say; and then maybe you'll be kind enough to come back to say another few words. And now, ladies and gentlemen, may I present the first of our guests from Capitol Hill—the respected and esteemed Speaker of the House of Representatives—in 30 years' member of Congress for the fourth district of Texas—the Honorable PAUL BAYBURN.

HARRISON. For over a century foreign policy was something which held comparatively little interest for most of the American people. Events of the past 20 years have changed this picture and it is no longer and does interest us our foreign affairs. Twice in that time we have poured our blood and our wealth into various wars in the defense of our country. Every day the morning paper tells us of some hitherto obscure part of the world where America is fighting new—old relations and interests—we have landed and are in grips with the enemy.

We now know, and we must never again forget, that we are directly and vitally involved in world affairs—that heretofore foreign policy was in the hands of a few diplomats alone but the entire nation and all groups within the nation.

We live, and we intend to remain, a government of the people, and our foreign policy must therefore be led by the will and convictions of the people.

HARRISON. Mr. Speaker is the one who occupies

place must responsibility and honor for the House of Representatives would now be placed on the shoulders of the Congress in maintaining and carrying out our foreign policy.

REMARKS: It is successful foreign policy which stands upon the common participation and support of the whole nation; the Congress as the representatives of the people has, indeed, an important part to play.

I should like to call to mind some of the action taken by the Congress, in cooperation with the Executive, in the dark years, from 1940 through 1941 to, read the aggressor's designs. The repeal of the arms embargo on 1940 the Lend Lease program and the Selective Service Act of 1940 the lend lease legislation in 1941. These measures have all played an important part in forging the weapons which yesterday threw back and today are beating down our enemies. These all were major acts of foreign policy. They were measures, measures of foreign policy which neither our House of Government could only be undertaken and effectively applied through the cooperation of the Executive and both houses of the Congress.

What do I see then, the future, Mr. Speaker?

REMARKS: The Congress is now giving attention to the future problems of maintaining the peace and security for which we fight. A few months ago the House of Representatives, by an overwhelming and bipartisan majority adopted the Fulbright resolution stating the participation of this country in international peace machinery. The striking declaration of the House of Representatives played an important part along with the Connally resolution of the Senate and the numerous Foreign Affairs Discretion as adopted at the Moscow Conference in making clear to the world that this nation stands united behind a foreign policy of effective international cooperation.

The Senate, of course, has a constitutional function of its own to perform in regard to treaties regarding our relations with other countries. But the House of Representatives now has a position in the field of foreign relations which, perhaps, is not as well understood as it should be. The House which is elected every two years is an exact representation of the opinions, the hopes and the fears of the American people on their home continent.

I have already mentioned some recent examples of major foreign policy measures in which the House of Representatives participated by exercising its legislative power. There are many others. For example all tariff bills must originate in the House, and this has meant that such well known foreign economic policy measures as the Reciprocity Trade Agreements Act are first considered in the House Committee on Ways and Means. Similarly, the Committee on Appropriations of the House maintains the close touch with the Department of State and reports of our foreign affairs. It is this Committee which distributes in the first instance in weekly and for what purposes largely not to be made available to the Department of State and other executive agencies doing foreign-affairs work. These are some of the less widely known phases of the House of Representatives part in the conduct of our foreign relations.

Best known to all is the work of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is this Committee which considered such measures as the repeal of the arms embargo, laid down, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration the Tollnight resolutions and other highly important matters of foreign policy.

In the coming months and years the United States will have many vital decisions to make on the nature of the arrangements which are to be established for the future maintenance of



per : If those suggestions are accepted, if we are to make them effective, we must represent the mass and have the sustained support of the American people as a whole. The Congress of the United States—the elected representatives of the American people—will do its duty, I am confident, in making the will of the American people effective in the promotion of international peace and well being.

HARRISON. Thank you, Speaker Bailew. Now I think we should try to get a little insight into the State Department's relations with Congress—from the man who handles that part of the post-Department's work—Assistant Secretary of State Haskins. Is he here? I'm right on that, am I not, Mr. Long? You are in charge of congressional relations?

LONG. Yes, Mr. Harrison, I am. But I should add that there is an aspect of the Department's work which also receives a great deal of personal attention from the Secretary himself.

HARRISON. Well, won't you go right ahead, Mr. Long—tell us—how close are the Department's relations with Congress?

LONG. Well as a matter of practice the officers of the Department are continually in touch with members of Congress in various ways. First is what might be termed routine business. The thousands of matters that constitute an important part of our work, including very considerable need for assistance affecting the interests of citizens abroad. Then, secondly, there are the matters of foreign policy in which the members of Congress have an official interest as legislators.

Also, there are the more formal relationships with the congressional committees. These are the most important phases of all the dealings between the Congress and the Department for, you see, the congressional committees initiate that proposed legislation which might have an effect upon our foreign relations is referred to the Secretary of State for an expression of



understanding of a particular foreign policy. Under these circumstances we in the State Department have frequently appeared before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations of which Senator Vandenberg is a member. Our consultations with this committee are cordial and I think the results have been very good.

However, Mr. Long, I'd like to ask you this: isn't it weird, almost an anachronism, and is it not representing the State Department in its relations with Congress? Which of these two jobs requires the best diplomatic talent?

Learn Mr. Hartman, "diplomats abroad", as you express it, I think is mostly common sense, mixed up with ordinary common sense, based on an understanding of our country's needs and interests. Our dealings with members of the Congress are on that basis, and we find that they too have "diplomats abroad".

Hartman: That's a nice compliment to your congressional friends. Mr. Long: Thank you, sir. Now let's hear from another legislator—the distinguished Republican Senator from Michigan, Arthur H. Vandenberg—senator and majority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, what are your views on the relationship of Congress and the State Department in the formulation and execution of foreign policy?

Vandenberg: The State Department and the Senate are in a congressional partnership in many aspects of American foreign policy. No one needs to be reminded that the Senate has a direct veto on all treaties. They require a two-thirds Senate ratification—and failure of such ratification can and has changed the course of history.

In a broader sense the State Department and Congress as a whole—the House as well as the Senate—are in a constitutional partnership. For example, only the whole Congress has a joint vote in each branch, can declare war,

Again the House is going to be urged with a sense of the urgency of the action, plans, strategy—and appropriations are often vital to implement foreign policy (even though we have abandoned some of our old ideas of "dollar diplomacy").

It is perfectly obvious, on the face of the record, that there should be the closest possible relationship therefore and the fullest possible advice between the State Department and the Congress in general and the Senate in particular.

I realize that diplomacy cannot always function in a town meeting and that there are many delicate international negotiations which cannot always be broadcast even to all members of the Senate and the House, particularly in time of war. But I profoundly believe that national policy—a "people's foreign policy"—will be sound and safer in proportion as these constitutional partners meet and close to gether in the discharge of their mutual functions.

I am happy to join in congratulating Secretary Hull and Chairman Chaulley of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the program that has been set in this direction. Senator Connally has brought in many representatives of the State Department to give the Foreign Relations Committee first-hand confidential information regarding foreign situations during the past year. It has been most helpful. It is the working of a partial partnership. I am particularly happy that Assistant Secretary Long is here tonight. He has often represented the State Department before this committee, and is one of our best able advisers.

HARRISON: Have you any current example before us, of the tangible value of these closer relationships?

VANDERBILT: Yes. The usefulness of this House is perhaps best illustrated by the recent history of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agreement between the United

cent, and 45 foreign powers. At last it was proposed to promulgate this as a simple executive agreement. The Senate promptly—and rightly—rose up on its high horse and said it was a treaty which had to be ratified by the Senate. Instead of fighting out this sterile deadlock, a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee sat down with representatives of the State Department; in mutual civility they made the agreement to submit the Senate it was no longer in the treaty class, it was now being submitted to both branches of Congress as part of a joint resolution of authority for appropriation. We are pulling together instead of pulling apart. That's a fine sample of the partnership cooperation which our "foreign policy" requires.

Mr. McN. Yes, I agree, Sir.

Mr. McN. I would be less than frank, however, if I did not say that there is still much progress needed in this direction. After carefully studying the State Department's so-called "White Paper"—starting our mission with Tokyo for it reveals preceding Pearl Harbor I am bound to say that neither Congress nor the country, nor the Senate Foreign Relations Committee itself, had the requisite information or ideas about the relations that were developing toward us which was Congress' constitutional responsibility to carry out. I must have been told one thing or another about Pearl Harbor which was tantamount to a surprise to the President and the State Department as it was to the House and to the country. I hasten to repeat that I fully understood that many of these subsequent disclosures could not have been made before. But I also repeat that the better we can approach more complete information and understanding among the constitutional partners who must deal with "foreign policy" the better our course will be.

I commend the State Department's praiseworthy efforts in this vital direction. The need

will infinitely multiply as we approach the peace-settlement of this world war. I hope and pray for a community of interests and action, upon a level of justice, which will best serve American and stabilized civilization everywhere. Meanwhile, please let me not be asked to participate. Hall, who is one of the truly great characters in modern statesmanship.

HARRISON. All right, Senator Taft along—thank you for. Now let's hear from one of the best known men on Capitol Hill—the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations—Senator Tom Connally of Maine.

CONNALLY. The most important fact about our being met together here tonight on the 13th anniversary of State is that it is not an unusual meeting. If there were something unusual about members of the Congress meeting with the Senators of State for discussion of our foreign affairs our nation, would, indeed, be in a peculiar state.

The integrity of our form of government rests upon the separation of the legislative and the executive powers. But the welfare of our country demands the not-less-a-very-close of all these two essential and independent branches of our Government. While then functions are independent, yet their objectives are the common good, and cooperation to that end is appropriate.

Let our people always remember that an ineffective government is only less undesirable than a tyrannical government. Tyranny is to be abhorred, but history teaches that tyrants guide a fractious people to freedom. Ineffective government on the other hand not infrequently induces the tyranny of either the demagogue or the corruptor.

HARRISON. Senator Connally, it seems to me that what you've just said is the story of much of Europe during the past 10 years or so.

CONNALLY. I firmly believe it.

HARRISON: Well, do you feel, too, that a more effective cooperation between the Congress and the Executive in the handling of our foreign affairs?

CORSON: If you mean Mr. Harbord, have we had such cooperation throughout our history? I would say that, with the exception of several tragic failures, we have generally had reasonable cooperation between the Congress and the Executive. It was this effective cooperation within our Government that has made it possible for our country to play an effective part in the common cause of the United Nations. The task, our main task, is the utter defeat of the Axis. Beyond that is our common ultimate goal—the establishment throughout the world of a just and enduring peace.

Let's not be too much about it. Another task will be won. It will not be easy to bring our enemies to their knees. The blood and treasure which are yet to be poured out in this cause cannot be measured. But we are committed and determined to see it through.

HARRISON: That's the way we all feel about it. Senator Connally, but where do we stand in this regard regarding the ultimate task of making sure, as Secretary Stettin just put it, "that all this has not happen again"?

CORSON: Well, as I just remarked, Mr. Harbord, this also will not be an easy task. But Heaven forbid any man should ever say that the ultimate objective of world peace is impossible! It is not impossible. And it is worth a valiant effort.

Senator Vandenberg has mentioned the constitutional responsibilities of the Senate in the approval of treaties. He has been most gracious in his references to my part in bringing representatives of the State Department and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee together for valuable exchanges of views and information on the foreign situation. Let me say that he is, as are the tasks of the Chairman of the

Senate Foreign Relations Committee will be in a position to do so as long as the Senate is in session with its colleagues who on this week, together with the opposition, have no other interest than the best interest of our country. Now, indeed, our committee has agreed with our common task with a greater spirit of helpfulness and universal service than has Senator Vandenberg.

Last fall, one hundred of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee presented to the Senate on behalf of the committee a resolution designed to make clear the intention of the Senate that the country should cooperate with its friends in securing a just and honorable peace and that the United States, acting through its constitutional process, should join with freedom as regards action in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world. After thorough discussion on the floor of the Senate, the resolution was adopted by an overwhelming vote.

The Senate of the United States has the responsibility to the world in determining that we intend to participate with other peace-loving nations to keep the peace which we now fight to gain.

However, Thank you, Senator Connally, and as I look to Secretary Hull.

Mr. Secretary, I wonder if you would comment on Senator Vandenberg's statement that neither the Congress nor the country had the correct information or idea about the realities that were creeping us toward war. I should be also said that he fully understood this many of the subjects in discussion—such as were made in the State Department's "White Paper"—could not have been made before.

Now Senator Vandenberg is a very old friend and I am always interested in what he has to say. I fully agree with his statement that many of the difficulties subsequently made could not be made before without jeopardizing our



national safety. But we certainly disagree on his first statement. My view is this: The tragedy of our present Harbor situation lies not in lack of warning or in the steadily approaching dangers to the hemisphere and this country. The President and I and other responsible officials did everything we could by attention and action to make clear and emphasize these growing dangers.

If these repeated warnings failed to impress some of our people, I can only explain such failure by the fact that, during that period, too many of our people profoundly believed that no serious danger from foreign wars did or could threaten this country and that about all the nation had to do to keep out of war was to stay at home and mind its own business. It was as impossible to convince these people against this profound conviction they entertained at the time as it would have been to convince them against any other profound belief held by them.

I am sure that we are all now agreed that in this experience lies our greatest lesson for the future. Speaker Rayburn, Senator Connally, Senator Vandenberg, and I are in complete agreement that effective cooperation between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government and unforgoing alertness on the part of our people to dangers as they threaten are all indispensable to our national safety and well being.

As this final program ends, I should like to say a few words of appreciation for the service of the National Broadcasting Company in arranging, through this series, for me, moderator and myself to speak to the people of this country on matters of such grave concern to all of us. I want to compliment Mr. Harkness for his conduct of the program. I am deeply grateful to Speaker Rayburn and to Senators Connally and Vandenberg for their contribution to the discussion this evening.

I sincerely hope that these programs will have  
led the American people to a better under-  
standing of what our foreign policy is about  
and of how it is conducted. There is no greater  
danger confronting a democracy in the conduct  
of its foreign affairs than indifference on the  
part of the people in the great issues at stake  
and the resulting absence of clear thinking and  
constructive criticism. The first duty of re-  
sponsible American citizenship is enlightened  
interest in public affairs, both domestic and  
foreign, and constant vigilance to every threat  
to national danger.

It is again I think was once again, Secretary  
Hall and thank you to our other distinguished  
guests, Speaker Rayburn, members Connally  
and Vandenberg and Assistant Secretary of  
State DeLoach and Long.

As all of you know, this is the last of this  
special limited series of programs arranged for  
us and by the NBC University of the Air to  
bring to the American people something of  
the work, procedure, and policies of our De-  
partment of State—highlighted by our members.  
The series has been most successful. And to all  
of you Americans who listened each week with  
such keen interest, to the many who wrote us  
letters of praise and constructive criticism, I  
want to say for NBC and the State Depart-  
ment—thanks a million. It's a real pleasure to  
serve you. Now—this is Harold Harkness,  
saying "Good night" from Washington.